

JAN 09 2007

Application No: 10/731,125
Attorney's Docket No: ALC 3103REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-30 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 13 and 19 are independent. Claim 1 is amended.

The courtesies extended to Applicant's representative by Examiner Lie at the telephone interview held January 8, 2007, are appreciated. The reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action are incorporated into the remarks below and constitute Applicant's record of the interview.

In section 2 on page 2, the Office Action rejects claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 for the specified reason. Examiner Lie is thanked for agreeing during the telephone interview held January 8, 2007, that the deletion of the word "if" from step (e) of claim 1 would overcome this rejection. Examiner Lie is further thanked for memorializing this agreement in the Interview Summary form.

Claim 1 is amended as described above. For at least this reason, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claim 1 as allegedly lacking patentable utility under 35 U.S.C. § 101 be withdrawn.

In section 4 on pages 2-7, the Office Action rejects claims 1-30 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over US Patent No. 6,018,524 to Turner et al. (hereinafter "Turner") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,813,620 to Lin et al. (hereinafter "Lin"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

JAN 09 2007

Application No: 10/731,125
Attorney's Docket No: ALC 3103

The rejection of claims 1-30 in section 4 of the Office Action is repeated from the Office Action dated June 14, 2006. Applicant responded to the rejection in the Request for Reconsideration filed August 4, 2006. The response to the rejection contained in the Request for Reconsideration filed August 4, 2006, is hereby incorporated by reference in its entirety.

In sections 5-9 on pages 7-8, the Office Action includes a section entitled "Response to Arguments." However, this section appears to overlook important aspects of the argument filed by the Applicant in the Request for Reconsideration dated August 4, 2006. Specifically, Lin uses multiple searches to perform a number of binary searches at the same time. However, Lin does not use a plurality of search instances, in parallel, to perform the same search. This subject matter is recited in all of the rejected claims.

For at least foregoing reasons, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 1-30 as allegedly being unpatentable over Turner in view of Lin be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

While we believe that the instant amendment places the application in condition for allowance, should the Examiner have any further comments or suggestions, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone the undersigned attorney in order to expeditiously resolve any outstanding issues.

Application No: 10/731,125
Attorney's Docket No: ALC 3103

In the event that the fees submitted prove to be insufficient in connection with the filing of this paper, please charge our Deposit Account Number 50-0578 and please credit any excess fees to such Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,
KRAMER & AMADO, P.C.



Mark R. Woodall
Registration No.: 43,286

Date: January 9, 2007

KRAMER & AMADO, P.C.
1725 Duke Street, Suite 240
Alexandria, VA 22314
Phone: 703-519-9801
Fax: 703-519-9802